



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,455	01/15/2004	Charles O. Townley	THUMB-604DIV	5634
<div>7590 Christopher John Rudy 209 Huron Ave., Ste. 8 Port Huron, MI 48060</div>			<div>EXAMINER PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 3738</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 09/23/2008</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10758455	1/15/04	TOWNLEY, CHARLES O.	THUMB-604DIV

Christopher John Rudy
209 Huron Ave., Ste. 8
Port Huron, MI 48060

EXAMINER

Brian E. Pellegrino

ART UNIT	PAPER
3738	20080918

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

With respect to Applicant's request 9/15/08 to consider the information disclosure statement filed 8/27/07 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(c) because it lacks the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. The IDS was filed after a FINAL and an Examiner considers an IDS when they comply having both a statement and a fee. In this application, no fee was submitted.

In response to Applicant's request to withdraw an objection to claim 27 for being a substantial duplicate of claim 38, a further review of the claims has been done by the Examiner and it was determined there was a sufficient distinction that the scope was different and thus the objection to claim 27 has been withdrawn by the Examiner.

/Brian E Pellegrino/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3738